

Serial No. 10/026,779

Docket No. SI-0015

Amdt. dated June 23, 2006

Reply to Office Action of April 5, 2006

REMARKS

By the present response, Applicant has canceled claim 15 without disclaimer. Further, Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 14 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-14 and 16-22 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 9-11, and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,359,880 (Curry et al.). Claims 4, 12 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curry et al. Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2001/0053145 (Willars et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,839,356 (Barany et al.). Claims 5-8, 15-18 and 20-22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Examiner Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner and his SPE for the interview held on June 21, 2006. At the interview, it was agreed that the proposed claim amendments, incorporated herein, overcome the current asserted art rejections.

Serial No. 10/026,779

Docket No. SI-0015

Amdt. dated June 23, 2006

Reply to Office Action of April 5, 2006

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 5-8, 15-18 and 20-22 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-3, 9-11 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Curry et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Curry et al. discloses a localized wireless gateway system that includes a plurality of base station transceivers and a packet service gateway. The transceivers provide two-way wireless voice frequency communications for the wireless terminals. The packet service gateway selected encouples the base station transceivers to the public packet data network. The gateway compresses and decompresses voice frequency communication signals and sends and receives the compressed signals in packet form via the network. The gateway also provides for signaling through the network to establish two-way voice communication sessions through the network.

Regarding claims 1, 9, and 19, Applicant submits that Curry et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination each of these claims. For example, the Examiner asserts that Curry et al. discloses interworking a RAN in an IP based core network at figure 1, items 31 (internet), 45 (PSTN gateway), and figure 2, item 5 (wireless gateway system). However, this is not interworking a RAN in an IP based core network, as recited in the claims of

the present application. Curry et al. merely discloses a wireless gateway system and a PSTN gateway interconnected to the internet. This is not interworking one network into another network. Further, the wireless gateway system, figure 2, item 5, in Curry et al. is not a radio access network, as recited in the claims of the present application. The wireless gateway system disclosed in Curry et al. includes a base station directly interfacing with a wireless device (see figure 2).

Further, Curry does not disclose or suggest establishing a traffic connection between a first mobile station (MS) and a first base station subsystem for IP (BSS-IP) where the establishing includes transmitting a call connection request message from the first MS through the first BSS-IP to a wireless call agent, confirming completion of the traffic connection to the first MS, and transmitting a response message from the first BSS-IP to the WCA. These limitations are neither disclosed nor suggested by Curry et al. The Examiner appears to assert that the radio port control unit item 63 of figure 2 is a wireless call agent. However, this is not a wireless call agent being coupled between a first BSS-IP and a second BSS-IP.

Moreover, the Examiner asserts that Curry et al. discloses interpreting a directory number of a second mobile station as requested by the first mobile station and a second base station subsystem for IP using a prescribed protocol, at col. 17, lines 37-67, col. 18, lines 1-16 and figure 2, item 61 (base station), 63 (radio port control unit) and item 5 (wireless gateway system). However, these portions of Curry et al. merely discloses a base station 61 and RPCU 63 that are

all contained within the wireless gateway system 5. Further, the RPCU interfaces with a PBX 65 also within the wireless gateway system 5. These portions are not interpreting a directory number of a second mobile station as requested by the first mobile station and establishing a traffic connection between the second mobile station and a second base station subsystem for IP, as recited in the claims of the present application. These portions merely disclose a mobile station interfacing with a wireless gateway system that contains a base station, and RPCU, interconnected to a PBX. Further, Curry et al. does not disclose or suggest the interpreting being done at a wireless call agent. As noted previously, Curry et al. does not disclose or suggest a wireless call agent.

Further, Curry et al. does not disclose or suggest wherein the WCA receives a call connection request message from a first MS through a first BSS-IP of the at least one BSS-IP, receives a response message from the first BSS-IP after confirmation of completion of a traffic connection to the first MS, transmits a paging message to the second MS through a second BSS-IP of the at least one BSS-IP by interpreting a directory number (DN) of the second MS as requested by the first MS, and transmits a response message after confirmation of the completion of a traffic connection to the second MS. These limitations are not disclose or suggested by Curry et al.

Regarding claims 2, 3, 10 and 11, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1 and 9 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Curry et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-3, 9-11 and 19 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claim 4, 12 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curry et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1 and 9 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicants submits that Curry et al. does not disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 4, 12 and 13 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willars et al. in view of Barany et al. Applicant has amended this claim with the subject matter of claim 15,

Serial No. 10/026,779

Docket No. SI-0015

Amdt. dated June 23, 2006

Reply to Office Action of April 5, 2006

deemed allowable by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicant submits that this claim is patentable over the cited references at least for these reasons.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 14 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Serial No. 10/026,779

Docket No. SI-0015

Amdt. dated June 23, 2006

Reply to Office Action of April 5, 2006

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing Amendment and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-14 and 16-22 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tlg

Date: June 23, 2006

\\f\k4\Documents\2029\2029-007\90998.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610